



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,572	06/03/2005	Malcolm Reginald Bell	020305-004002	3580
34313	7590	11/18/2008	EXAMINER	
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP			HAGEMAN, MARK	
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4 PARK PLAZA				3653
SUITE 1600				
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/18/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/537,572	Applicant(s) BELL ET AL.
	Examiner Mark Hageman	Art Unit 3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 September 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-18 and 20-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 13-18 and 20-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 13 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear what the actual acceptance criteria are regarding the internal security range. It seems that following an item in the internal security range a subsequent item will be accepted if it lies outside the internal security range but inside the (high or low) probability region. The claim however seems to say that any subsequent item outside the internal security range (regardless of the acceptance probability range) will be accepted (see lines 28-29 of claim 13). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claim 13-18 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 13 recites the limitation "a second money item" in line 13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Furthermore claim 14 recites "said first money item." Applicant's amendment removed any reference to a first money item from claim 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 13-18 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/48138 to Bell et al. Bell discloses a money item acceptor (p3 lines 25+) comprising: a signal source (p3 lines 27+) to produce a money item parameter signal as a function of a sensed characteristic of a money item, a store (p3 lines 28+) to provide data corresponding to a normal acceptance range of values of the parameter signal for a money item of a particular denomination, the range including high and low acceptance probability regions wherein the value of a parameter signal corresponds to a relatively high or low probability of an occurrence of a sensed money item of said particular denomination, and a processor configuration (p3 lines 33+).

7. Examiner notes the presence of multiple conditional statements in the claims. For instance "when an occurrence..." and "if the second occurrence..." As discussed in the restriction requirement dated 3-6-2008 Examiner notes that if both possible outcomes are not addressed these limitations fail to further limit the claim. For instance claim 13 states, "to determine when an occurrence of the parameter signal corresponding to a first money item adopts a first predetermined value relationship..." What happens when the parameter signal of the first money item never "adopts a first

predetermined value relationship?" When this condition is not established the rest of the following claim language fails to provide any further limitation.

8. Examiner notes that these limitations are not required by the claims because the other possibility is not considered. For example a claim that states if A then B does not account for the if not A case and therefore in the not A case there is no limitation or result. Positively claiming both possible outcomes requires that claim perform some action for either possible input and therefore requires the prior art to consider both possibilities. A claim stating if A then B and if not A then C is only anticipated by a reference that accounts for the proper response to both the A and not A cases in the claimed manner. A claim stating only if A then B only considers one situation and therefore fails to provide any limitation in the if not A case.

9. All of the defendant claims relate directly to the processor configuration and therefore as set forth above are functional. The Bell reference anticipates these claims as it is readily capable of functioning in the claimed manner.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 9-2-2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner acknowledges applicant's remarks and agrees that the amendments have linked the processor to the structural elements of the claim. Examiner also acknowledges that both accept and reject cases are considered for the two specific control scenarios. Examiner notes however that the claim does not take

into account what happens when a parameter signal does not fall within the low acceptance range or the internal security range. All of the processor limitations still require one of these two situations to take place before they provide any limitation to the claim. To remedy this issue the claim must also account for the processing of a normal coin that does not meet the specific criteria (assumably acceptance if in the low or high probability acceptance range and rejected if not). Examiner agrees that if all of the limitations of claim 13 are presented in a manner that they are positively recited and absolutely required (all sides of all conditionals accounted for) that Bell will not anticipate the specific internal security range limitations.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Hageman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3027. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick H. Mackey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3653

MCH